

Safety Advisory Committee

September 5, 2014

1:30 – 3:00 PM

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
V. Potapenko, M. O. Leimer, J. Willen	Human Resources Advisors	
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	
Bluhm, Hendrik	Chemical Sciences Division	X
Buonsanti, Raffaella	Materials Sciences Division	
Chernowski, John	Facilities Division	X
Christensen, John N.	Earth Sciences Division	X
Dardin, Steve	Physics Division	
Franaszek, Stephen	Genomics Division	X
Giuntoli, Patricia	Computing Sciences Directorate	X
Greiner, Leo	Nuclear Science Division	
<i>vacant</i>	Environmental Energy Technologies Division	
Martin, Michael C.	Advanced Light Source Division	
Sauter, Nicholas	Physical Biosciences Division	X
Seidl, Peter	Accelerator & Fusion Research Division; SAC Chair	X
Taylor, Scott E.	Life Sciences Division	X
Tomaselli, Ann	Information Technology Division	X
Thomas, Patricia M.	Safety Advisory Committee Secretary	X
van der Lippe, Henrik	Engineering Division	

Others Present: Stephanie Collins, Jim Floyd, Marshall Granados, Mike Kritscher, Ian Sharp, Greta Toncheva, Mike Wisherop

Comments from the Chair – Peter Seidl

Ian Sharp was introduced as the new Chair of the Laser Safety Subcommittee. Ian is enthusiastic about this opportunity. He has been at LBNL since 2011 and is a staff scientist in Physical Biosciences Division. Previously, he was part of a research group in Munich, Germany.

Lawrence Road Update – Mike Wisherop

There were some requests for an update on the status of Lawrence Road. The road had been closed to traffic because dirt had fallen through a crack between the retaining wall and the bridge onto the road below. Following evaluation by UC and LBNL, a temporary barrier was installed to catch any debris and the road was re-opened. UC is planning to do more work to stabilize the area this winter.

ESH Documents Pipeline – Mike Wisherop

The safety policies in development that have had some change in status since the last meeting are the ones in green on the pipeline table:

Revision Type	Documents	Program/Policy	Significance	Status
Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Major Revision	Policy and Program	Traffic and Pedestrian Safety	C	Work group edits being incorporated into draft.
CHSP Reformat – ENP program changes	Program	CHSP	D	Final edits to reformatted program
Biosafety Program Reformat	Program	Biosafety	NA	Reformatted program combines Biosafety Manual and Program
EHS Training Program Change	Program	EHS Training	D	Clarification of training waivers (who can and when)
Pressure Safety and Cryogenics Program Major Revision	ESH Manual	Pressure Safety and Cryogenics Program	C	Working group established. Mostly clarifications, potentially new requirements.
Laser Safety Program Major Revision	ESH Manual	Laser Safety Program	C	New requirements
Fall Protection Program Major Revision	ESH Manual	Fall Protection Program	C	New requirements
OJT requirements, conditions for performing work without required training.	TBD	EHS Training Program/Policy	TBD	Description of OJT requirements for WPC. Divisions to determine methods.
Electrical Safety Program Major Revision	RPM, ESH Manual	Electrical Safety Program	TBD (C)	Electrical Safety Subcommittee has started working on changes to program. Will provide periodic updates to SAC.

Change to Radiation Safety Program – Conversion to Rad Con Manual format, and addition of new requirements from DOE O 458.1 CH. 2.	RPM/EHS Manual/Rad Con Manual	Radiation Safety, Environmental Radiation	D	RPG is working with the RSC on requirements, language and format of Rad Con manual. 7 Policies posted in RPM.
--	-------------------------------	---	---	---

SAC Planning Discussion – Peter Seidl

The SAC has completed ESH Peer Reviews for Materials Sciences Division, Accelerator & Fusion Research Division, Earth Sciences Division, Energy & Environmental Technologies Division, Nuclear Science Division, Engineering Division, and Facilities Division. The Peer Reviews included participation from Division Directors, senior Division management and staff, the Office of Contractor Assurance, and Human Resources. Each review resulted in a brief report of observations and recommendations. After the review, the Division Directors report back to SAC, providing feedback on the review process and their response to the review.

Peter Seidl proposed that SAC continue the Peer Review process and requested input on how to go forward on selecting the next Divisions to be reviewed, and setting the review schedule. The SAC Charter needs to be updated to reflect the new process. If each Division is reviewed every 3 years, as described in the existing charter, SAC would need to complete 5 reviews/year. The level of effort required for previous reviews indicates that this schedule would be impractical. It was proposed that SAC plan to complete 2-3 reviews/year. The next question is, how should SAC select the Divisions to be reviewed? Some possibilities discussed were:

- Consult with Associate Lab Directors;
- Combine Divisions with similar hazards;
- Risk assessment approach, considering recent accident/incident records and/or severity of potential incidents;
- Change management approach, focusing on new Divisions and Division Directors who have not been previously reviewed;
- Value-added approach, considering whether there are other recent reviews that cover the Division's hazards;
- Geographic approach, combining co-located Divisions;
- Cross-division reviews, similar to HSS preparation reviews, but more management-focused;
- Structural approach, considering size and complexity of Divisions.

Peter Seidl asked **Committee members to discuss the possible approaches to selecting Divisions for Peer Review with their Division Directors and provide feedback to Peter before the October 3 meeting.** One of the purposes of the Peer Review is to encourage more Division Director involvement in safety. The Associate Lab Director role in safety culture improvement is also increasing. The Peer Review process provides Division Directors with feedback on an aspect of safety that they have defined and requested. It allows for deeper exploration of cultural issues than Occurrence Report investigations, which focus on specific incident(s) and required corrective actions. The report belongs to the Division Director, with discussion at the ALD level.

There was a suggestion that SAC keep track of changes and improvements to safety management that result from Peer Reviews, to document the effectiveness of the reviews.

Work Planning and Control Update – Michelle Flynn

The WPC “Soft Launch” will continue through September 2014. About half of the Divisions have been having meetings and starting to enter data. Divisions are continuing to provide feedback on their experiences with the system. The most frequent comments have been about the hazards analysis system content (34 comments), questions about existing Activity Manager capabilities (28 comments), requests for additional Activity Manager capabilities (28 comments), and software bugs in the Activity Manager system (24 comments). Some of the features people are requesting already exist – they just had difficulty finding them. Requests for changes will be prioritized. The system should work on any browser.

The project team has been providing updates to the Safety Advisory Committee, Division Safety Coordinators, EHS Division, and Berkeley Site Office. There have been communications to Division leadership teams and safety committees, and Beta test and Soft Launch participants. The new website is <http://wpc.lbl.gov/> and several useful training modules have been posted on the website. A Lab Director’s message should be coming out soon. There will be a general awareness campaign, as well as Division-specific communications where requested. A discussion of the transition process from Job Hazards Analyses (JHAs) to WPC Activity work authorizations was scheduled for discussion at the September 12 Division Safety Coordinators Committee meeting.

SAC members provided feedback that some Activity Leads are unclear or uncomfortable about their new responsibilities under WPC. They are asking for more direction on the roles and responsibilities of Activity Leads. Lab employees have not had very much communication yet on WPC from Lab leadership (Lab Director, ALDs, Division Directors).

The next steps are for Divisions to continue participating in the Soft Launch, develop draft transition plans, and communicate/socialize WPC among their people. The project team and EHS will work with the software vendor team to complete the Activity Manager application, revise the hazards and control content in response to comments, provide additional training, develop the JHA transition process, continue communications, and develop a lab-wide transition plan.

In October, Divisions will be concentrating on the F\$M rollout. The official transition to WPC work authorizations will begin in November.

Closing Remarks

Possible agenda items for October meeting include:

- Mechanical Safety Subcommittee update
- Electrical Safety update
- Fire safety update
- Discussion of SAC Charter and agenda for November meeting with Lab Director

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 PM

Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SAC Secretary